DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lecheler (U.S.

6,425,008) in view of Schumacher (U.S. 6,978,265).

As per claim 1, Lecheler teaches a method for identifying the source of an event in a

computer network, comprising the steps of: associating an identifier tag with an event occurring

within the computer network, wherein the identifier tag uniquely identifies a collection computer

monitoring the event based on a domain name (column 2, lines 47-54; column 4, lines 30-40;

figure 4, step 116, 118); receiving, in a management computer, information from the collection

computer that includes the identifier tag (column 6, line 66 – column 7, line 5; figure 4, step

120); deriving, by the management computer, an identification of the collection computer from

the identifier tag based on the domain name (column 4, lines 47-57; column 4, line 66 – column

5, line 5; column 6, line 66 – column 7, line 5); and identifying to a user the source of the event

by displaying to the user the identification of the at least one collection computer (column 5,

lines 7-9, 63-66; column 6, line 66 – column 7, line 5; figure 5). Lecheler does not specifically

teach that the collection and management computers for a certain domain may be implemented

by multiple computers. Schumacher teaches the implementation of multiple management and

collection computers for a single domain (Figure 1; column 3, line 56 – column 4, line 12). It

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to

implement the use of multiple collection and management computers to correspond to a certain

domain, as taught by Schumacher in the system of Lecheler. The motivation for doing so lies in

the fact that additional collection and management computers would allow for the

accommodation of a large number of computers within a certain domain, such that the increase

in collection/management computers would more efficiently serve a larger population within the

domain. Lecheler-Schumacher discusses the display of a network address of a network element

that generated the event, but chooses not use it in the invention. Instead, Lecheler-Schumacher

teaches the display of a resolved network address of a network element that generated an event

(column 4, lines 41-65), as it would be more convenient to convert these network addresses into

unique domain identifiers for efficient identification (Lecheler: column 6, lines 13-25).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to include displaying the network address of a network element that generated the

event, as it is a different option of displaying the required information; a design choice by the

inventors leading to the same result, rather than a patentable distinction.

As per claim 2, Lecheler-Schumacher teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the

identifier tag is a name of the at least one collection computer (Lecheler: column 4, lines 49-52).

As per claim 3, Lecheler-Schumacher teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the step of

deriving comprises the step of: maintaining within the at least one management computer a

database of identification information associated with identifier tags (Lecheler: figure 3; column 5, line 66 – column 6, line 4).

As per claim 5, Lecheler-Schumacher teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the step of identifying comprises the step of: mapping each collection computer to a group of collection computers using the identifier tag (Lecheler: column 5, line 66 – column 6, line 1). Lecheler-Schumacher does discuss the identification to the user the source of the event using the group of collection computers (Lecheler: column 6, lines 5-12). Using the network address of a network element that generated the event, to identify the source of the event to the user, would have been obvious by the same argument as claim 4.

As per claim 6, Lecheler-Schumacher teaches the method of claim 1, comprising the steps of: managing, by the collection computer, at least one network object (Lecheler: figure 1; column 3, lines 57-60; column 4, lines 19-21); and resolving, by the collection computer, a network address of each network object into a resolved network address included in the information received at the at least one management computer (Lecheler: column 4, lines 47-49; column 5, lines 5-8).

As per claim 7, Lecheler-Schumacher teaches a system for identifying the source of an event in a computer network, comprising: a plurality of collection computers, wherein an identifier tag uniquely identifies each collection computer or group of collection computers based on a domain name, and wherein the identifier tag is associated with an event occurring within the computer network (Lecheler: figure 1; column 2, lines 52-54; column 4, lines 28-34; figure 4, steps 116, 118; figure 5; Schumacher: Figure 1; column 3, line 56 – column 4, line 12); at least one management computer for receiving information from the plurality of collection

computers that includes the identifier tag, wherein each management computer derives an

identification of each collection computer or group of collection computers from the identifier

tag based on the domain name (Lecheler: figures 1, 4a, and 4b; column 4, lines 47-57; column 4,

line 66 – column 5, line 5; Schumacher: Figure 1; column 3, line 56 – column 4, line 12); and

means for identifying to a user the source of the event by displaying to the user the identification

of each collection computer or group of collection computers and a network address of a network

element that generated the event (Lecheler: column 5, lines 7-9, 63-66; figure 5; Schumacher:

Figure 1; column 3, line 56 – column 4, line 12).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on September 5, 2007 have fully been considered, but are not

persuasive.

a. Applicant asserts that Lecheler does not teach "identifying to a user the source of the

event by displaying to the user the identification of the at least one collection computer and a

network address of a network element that generated the event, the at least one collection

computer being at least one of a collection computer and a group of collection computers."

Examiner asserts that Lecheler, in column 4, lines 41-65, teaches identification of the collection

computer and a location identifier of the element that generated the event (converted from a

network address of the element). Lecheler already contemplates the existence of duplicate

network addresses, and therefore converts it into an identifier through which the element may

uniquely be identified. As discussed above, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill

in the art to include the use of the network address to identify the element, because in view of

Lecheler, it would have been a design choice to either use the unique converted identifier

(derived from the network address of the element) or to use the actual network address of the

element within the unique identifier. Such an embodiment is common in the field of duplicate IP

addresses, and given Lecheler's use of a network address to identify a network element, it would

have been obvious to include that this information is specifically sent to a user for display.

Schumacher is relied upon to include the concept that collection computers may be multiple

nodes, which renders the Applicant's contention that Schumacher does not teach identification of

an event source, for example, irrelevant.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing

date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tanim Hossain whose telephone number is 571/272-3881. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am - 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jason Cardone can be reached on 571/272-3933. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Tanim Hossain
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2145

/Jason D Cardone/
Supervisory Patent Examiner,
Art Unit 2145